AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116   **PATENT APPLICATION**
U.S. Application No.: 10/037,560   Atty. Docket No.: CQ10139

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination of the subject patent application in light of the present Amendment and Remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16, 19, 21, and 23-36, i.e., all of the pending claims, are indicated as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a). However, two references are used to support this rejection - Munroe, USP '614 and Colburn, USP '404. Accordingly, Applicant treats this rejection as being under 35 U.S.C. 103.

I.   Claim 1 and its dependent claims

The Munroe reference has already been discussed in the previous Reply, filed April 23, 2005, where it has been demonstrated that the Munroe scheme cannot be employed in a modem PC operating system, such as Windows®. Notably, it has been explained that the presently claimed invention enables decoupling of the user's access rights from the protection level applied to an object. To achieve this feature, the claimed invention assigns to each object a trust value and an object type, and assigns to each process a trust value. A set of rules is stored in the computer for each combination of object trust value, process trust value, and object type. In this manner, two objects having the same trust values may receive high protection, but access to these files by a process would depend not only on their trust value, but on the combination of trust value of the object, of the process, and on the object type. As demonstrated in the previous Reply, Munroe failed to disclose this feature as claimed in the pending claims. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Colburn fails to remedy the deficiencies of Munroe and that the combination of Munroe and Colburn fails to make the pending claims unpatentable.

As admitted in the pending Office Action, Monroe fails to disclose at least the limitations of claim 1:

8

"defining at least two object types;

assigning an object type to each of the objects;

defining an action rule for each combination of process trust group value, object trust group value, and object type; and,

upon an access request by a requesting process to a target object, performing the action indicated by the action rule applicable to the trust group value of the requesting process, the trust group value of the target object, and the object type."

Applicant respectfully submits that Colburn fails to disclose these claimed features, and the combination of Munroe and Colburn fails to disclose or suggest these features. For example, it is alleged that Colburn's Figure 3 and the disclosure on column 5, line 65 through column 6, line 28 discloses the limitations: "defining at least two object types; and assigning an object type to each of the objects." However, no such disclosure is provided in the cited reference. Rather, Colburn discloses various different objects (70-78), which "correspond to particular types of entities or articles..." (Col. 6, Ln. 5-7). However, Colburn does not disclose that these objects are of <u>different</u> types or that they are being <u>assigned</u> a <u>different object type</u>.

Similarly, it is alleged that Colburn's Tables 1 and 2 and Col. 9, ln. 1 through Col. 10, ln. 5 discloses the limitations: "defining an action rule for each combination of process trust group value, object trust group value, and object type." However, no such disclosure is provided in the cited reference. That is, in the cited Colburn disclosure there is no reference to a process trust group value or object trust group value. Rather, Colburn's cited disclosure bases the permission decision on Access Constraints and one of the enumerated conditions is met. Nowhere is Colburn discloses or even remotely suggests that the permission table is constructed according to "each combination of process trust group value, object trust group value, and object type."

Moreover, as can be understood from Colburn's cited disclosure, the major thrust of Colburn's disclosed permission system is access based, i.e., user authorization. The system

9

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116   **PATENT APPLICATION**
U.S. Application No.: 10/037,560   Atty. Docket No.: CQ10139

always checks to see whether the access authorization is for "owner," "all" or "exemplar." As noted in the subject specification and in the previous Reply, one advantageous feature of the claimed invention is the decoupling of the user access permission from the authorization process. For example, claim 1 explicitly recites: "assigning objects and processes in the computer to one of said trust groups, irrespective of the rights of a user of said computer." Clearly, Colburn's cited disclosure is contrary to this limitation and an attempt to combine Colburn's disclosure with Monroe's disclosure would cause a conflict and will not provide a suggestion of how to generate the inventive system that decouples the user access rights from the permission decision.

Finally, it is alleged that on Col. 10, lines 6-14 Colburn discloses the limitation: "performing the action indicated by the action rule applicable to the trust group value of the requesting process, the trust group value of the target object, and the object type." However, Applicant respectfully submits that no such disclosure is to be found in the cited passage. The cited passage only proposes that "[T]hese security features provide various security levels by which objects from trusted and secure sources can have extensive access to a user's computer system resources or objects while objects from unknown or untrusted sources have only limited, relatively safe access rights." There is no disclosure or suggestion, whatsoever of the claimed decision process of selecting an access rule that is "applicable to the trust group value of the requesting process, the trust group value of the target object, and the object type."

II.   Claim 13 and its dependent claims

While in the pending Office Action claims 1 and 13 are treated together and are rejected using a single line of reasoning, claims 13 is couched in a language that is vastly different from claim 1. Indeed, claim 13 recites various limitations that are not found in claim 1 and are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references or any combinations thereof. For example, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fails to disclose, and that the Examiner failed to point to any disclosure relating to at least the limitations:

10

"define a first and a second rule sets, each of said rule sets comprising a plurality of rules defining an action based on an operation type;

define a table of at least two trust groups, wherein each trust group comprise one trust group value and said first and second rule sets; and

assign objects and processes in the computer to one of said trust groups irrespective of the rights of a user of said computer;

whereby upon operation of a process over an object, the computer is configured to:

compare a trust group value of the process with a trust group value of the object;

determine whether to allow the operation by following the rules of said first rule set if the trust group value of the process is not smaller than the trust group of the object and

following the rules of said second rule set if the trust group value of the process is smaller than the trust group value of the object."

If the Examiner wishes to maintain the rejection of claim 13, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to particularly point out where in the cited references these limitations can be found.

At least for these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and all of its depending claims are allowable over the cited references and any combinations thereof.

III.   Claim 23 and its dependent claims

With respect to claim 23, Applicant respectfully submits that the reasoning for the standing rejection is inconsistent and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection. For example, it is alleged that Munroe discloses the limitation: "a list of object trust groups, each trust group defining an object trust value and coupled to at least one of said rules." [emphasis added]. However, it is admitted that "Munroe et al. does not teach a list of object

11

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116   **PATENT APPLICATION**
U.S. Application No.: 10/037,560   Atty. Docket No.: CQ10139

types and a list of rules, each rule defining an action based on an object type." (bottom of page 8 of the pending Office Action). Since Munroe admittedly fails to disclose a list of rules, how could it possibly be that Munroe discloses "each trust group defining an object trust value and coupled to at least one of said rules?" Clearly Munroe does not disclose this limitation.

Similarly, Colburn fails to teach or suggest limitations specified in claim 23. For example, while it is alleged that Colburn teaches "a list of rules each of said rules defining an action based on an object type," Colburn actually teaches a list of rules that are based on access authorization (all, owner, exemplar) not based on object type.

The remaining claims provide features that further distinguish the claimed invention from Monroe and Colburn and their combination, or any other prior art of record.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits an early Notice of Allowance. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time that may be required to keep this application alive.

12

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116   **PATENT APPLICATION**
U.S. Application No.: 10/037,560   Atty. Docket No.: CQ10139

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Bach
Registration No. 37,771

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (650) 625-8100
Facsimile: (650) 625-8110

MOUNTAIN VIEW OFFICE
23493
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 26, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is
being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office this
26th day of August, 2005.

Mariann Tam

13